DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 118 EA 019 031

AUTHOR Loehr, Peter
TITLE Relationships between Teacher Interview Scores and On-the-Job Performance.
INSTITUTION Lorain City Schools, Ohio.
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators (48th, Houston, TX, October 26-31, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Policy; Compliance (Legal); Elementary Secondary Education; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Interviews; Employment Practices; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Evaluation Criteria; Performance Factors; Personnel Policy; School Districts; Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Rights; *Teacher Selection; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Preemployment Skills

ABSTRACT

Relationships between classroom teacher preemployment interview scores and performance during the first 6 months of employment were investigated in an Ohio school district. Permanently employed teachers were the target of the study, which used data from 4 aspects of interview scores and 13 performance criteria to study relationships between 2 groups. Group "A" was composed of 14 individuals who interviewed consistently well; group "B" was comprised of 12 individuals who interviewed consistently less well. Research included descriptive data of those hired concerning age, race/ethnicity, training, experience, date of hire, and salary. Such information was part of monitoring nondiscriminatory employment practices and results. On each of the 13 performance-related items, the "A" group performed better than did the "B" group. Interview procedures are concluded to have a predictive value in teacher job performance. Descriptive data ensured that interview procedures provided equal employment opportunities. Bachelor degree grade point averages are not related to interview scores or teaching performance. Based on this study's findings, recommendations are (1) to improve personnel department responsibilities, (2) to lessen the school district's liability in allegations of illegal discrimination, and (3) to monitor interview and selection procedures. Data results and interview profiles are included. (CJH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED277118

# RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER INTERVIEW SCORES AND ON-THE-JOB PERFORMANCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter Loehr

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Peter Loehr, Ph.D.

Director
Personnel & Labor Relations

LORAIN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

1020 Seventh Street
Lorain, Ohio 44052-1493

Phone: (216) 246-8000

EA 019 034

A self-initiated study to determine the relationships between pre-employment interview scores and actual performance of classroom teachers during the first six months of employment in conjunction with monitoring Equal Employment, Affirmative Action, and Equal Educational Opportunities.

July 1986

# A B S T R A C T

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER INTERVIEW SCORES AND ON-THE-JOB PERFORMANCE: A self-initiated study in conjunction with monitoring equal employment, affirmative action, and equal educational opportunities (16 pp). Peter Loehr, Ph.D., Director of Personnel & Labor Relations; Lorain City Schools; 1020 Seventh Street; Lorain, Ohio 44052; phone (216) 246-5000.

Relationships between classroom teacher pre-employment interview scores and performance during the first six months of employment were investigated. All persons involved in the study were employed in the school district as regular teachers (not substitutes). Data from four aspects of interview scores and 13 performance criteria were used to study relationships between two groups. Group "A" was composed of 14 persons who interviewed consistently well. Group "B" was composed of 12 persons who interviewed consistently less well.

The study also included descriptive data of the persons hired concerning age, race/ethnicity, training, experience, date of hire, and salary. Such information was part of monitoring non-discriminatory employment practices and results.

On each of the 13 performance-related items, the "A" group which interviewed better also performed better. The interview procedures, thus, were concluded to have a predictive value in teacher on-the-job performance. Descriptive data insured that the interview procedures provided equal employment opportunities. Bachelor degree grade point averages were not found to be related to interview scores or teaching performance.

Based on the findings from this study, recommendations were made to improve personnel department responsibilities, to lessen the school district's liability in allegations of illegal discrimination, and to monitor interview and selection procedures.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of
the American Association of School Personnel
Administrators (48th, Houston, Texas,
October 26-31, 1986).

# RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHER INTERVIEW SCORES AND ON-THE-JOB PERFORMANCE

## I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Lorain City School District is committed to equal employment opportunities as well as affirmative action to increase its minority representation among employees. The public school district is also committed to provide high quality education to students. Federal, state, and professional standards require or recommend that an objective, job-related, and fair personnel selection "system" be used, rather than rely on the individual judgment of individual personnel officers. Potential complaints of age, sex, or race/ethnic discrimination also necessitate a documented basis for decision-making to defend the district's assets.

At the time this study began, documented answers to the following questions were not readily at hand:

1. What is the predictability of personal interviews to actual, on-the-job performance of classroom teachers?
2. Do persons who interview "better" really perform better?
3. What is the basis for such judgments?

The purpose of this report is to answer these questions based on objective and systematic methods.

## II. METHOD

To accurately compare pre-employment interview results with on-the-job performance, numerical values need to be assigned to the factors being compared. A numerical interview score of "98" cannot be compared to an

evaluation narrative description of "works well with students and others." Likewise, a narrative interview description of "good language ability" is difficult to compare to a performance rating of "88." Also, two narrative descriptions cannot be compared without first being coverted to numerical values.

The following methods were used to produce numerical values for pre-employment interview results and numerical values for post-employment, on-the-job performance.

## A. Establishing Interview Scores

During the past two years (since the employment of the current personnel director), this school district has used a consistent interview procedure in the personnel department. These procedures have been used for several years by this writer in selecting teachers and non-teaching personnel in both the public and private sector. This writer also presented these procedures to Ohio superintendents at the 1983 Summer Conference of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators and has written other articles on objectifying personnel selection procedures.

The interview procedures involved asking the same questions to each interviewee. As illustrated below, the criteria to judge desired responses were based on predetermined "right" answers. These "right" answers were developed from the characteristics of effective schools, dimensions of guidance developed by the Ohio Department of Education, or local district philosophy or priorities. Judgment of the quality of responses was based on the training and experience of the interviewer and recorded on a 1 through 5 basis during the interview, with 1 low and 5 high.

As an equal opportunity employer, the purpose of a personal interview is to give persons being interviewed a similar opportunity to demonstrate their differences related to the positions for which they are interviewing. Using similar questions also facilitates comparing various interview results over a period of time.

The following is a sample question with desired responses. The interviewees were asked the question (as in quote marks) and the interviewer listened for the specific criteria and judged on a 1 through 5 basis ONLY for those criteria. This question is one of six asked each applicant during the period of this study. There were 28 criteria measured with the responses from the six questions. The total from these 28 criteria (140 maximum, 28 minimum) formed the basis for one of four numerically-based evaluation selection standards.

RE: Discipline and instructional approaches.

"As you can well imagine, discipline is an important part of teaching. Please discuss your concept of WHY students misbehave and what you would do to prevent unnecessary disturbances."

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Searching for real problem CAUSES. | . | . | . | . | . |
| 11. Importance of classroom organization/mgmt. | . | . | . | . | . |
| 12. Use/importance of positive reinforcement. | . | . | . | . | . |
| 13. Importance of instructional mission. | . | . | . | . | . |

Other questions dealt with instructional decision-making, teacher-student counseling, student and self-evaluation, and relationships with others.

Following the six verbal questions, assessments on "personable" and "leadership" qualities were made by the interviewer. The "personable" qualities were judged on a 1 through 10 scale from "cold & aloof" to "warm & friendly." This was determined to be a BFOQ (Bonafide Occupational Qualification) criteria because to be effective in dealing with students and adults, a teacher's personality should appeal to students. (S)he must be perceived to be firm, fair, and friendly; enthusiastic; dedicated to the best interests of students; and intellectually capable of motivating students in a variety of ways to learn to their maximum potential. (S)he must be personable enough not to be cold and aloof so that students can work with the person in a non-threatening relationship. This evaluation formed the second numerical basis for assessing applicants.

Leadership qualities were assessed as follows and formed the third basis for a numerical assessment of applicants:

RE: Leadership qualities. (Evaluated indirectly, without questioning.)

INTERVIEWER: As a leader who must motivate a group of students to do some things they initially might not want to do, how effective do you perceive this applicant to be as a disciplinarian? Do you feel that students would want to take direction from this person easily and willingly even with unpleasant tasks?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |

Ineffective Effective

The fourth numerical assessment of applicants was their Bachelor Degree grade point average. It was thought that applicants with higher BA GPAs would be more effective teachers. As will be discussed later in this report, this belief was not sustained by the study.

Following each interview, an applicant "profile" was made which included the following:

| | STANDARD INTERVIEW RESULTS | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| BA GPA | Sect A-F Teaching Effectiveness | Sect H Personable | Sect I Leadership |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| High = 3.3+ | 100+ | 9+ | 9+ |
| Good = 2.9+ | 85+ | 8+ | 8+ |
| Low = 2.6+ | 70+ | 6+ | 6+ |
| Reject= 2.5- | 69- | 5- | 5- |

The divisions of interview assessments into the above "high," "good," "low," and "rejectable" were based on an analysis of scores for persons interviewed during the 1984 calendar year. Candidates, for example, with scores of 100 or higher on the "teaching effectiveness" part of the interview seemed to be high scorers. The frequency distribution of such grouped scores for persons hired in 1985 is discussed later in this report. To facilitate retrieval of interview data by teaching potential, following this profile, a "bottom line" summary of A, B, C, D, or F (the same as students are graded) was made, as illustrated below. A full copy of the Applicant Profile form is attached as an appendix.

---------"B O T T O M  L I N E"---------

____ A. Highest quality applicant; consider for any applicable vacancy.
____ B. Very good applicant; keep applicant current.
____ C. Average applicant.
____ D. Below average applicant; only consider if no one else available.
____ F. Unsatisfactory applicant; consider no further.

The applicants who continue to be considered for employment must have a "bottom line" rating of average or above. A recent study of 100 random

actual interview scores and "bottom line" summaries indicated only 39% of the persons interviewed were average or above according to these criteria.

References were also checked, as explained in the next section, and candidates who interviewed well, but had inferior references, were rejected from further consideration. Final selection required both high interview scores, good references, and principal concurrence or recommendation.

Of the 45 new teachers employed during the 1985 calendar year, 40 had been interviewed using the interview procedure outlined above. Candidates not so interviewed included a Special Education Vocational Evaluator, Vocational Auto Body teachers (2), Elementary Counselor, and Speech & Hearing Therapist. These persons were interviewed using BFOQ criteria pertinent to their special areas.

Of the 40, 14 were selected who had consistently high interview scores by achieving a minimum of one "high" and two "goods" on the above scale (not counting BA GPA). Likewise, of the 40, 12 were selected who had consistently lower interview scores by achieving a maximum of one "good" and the remainder "low" or "rejectable." No one was hired who had "rejectable" in all criteria. Two pesons who would have been included were not because they resigned during the calendar year and performance data were not available on them.

The averages of interviewees hired and those not hired are reported below. The reader will note that there are differences in the Teaching Effectiveness (23.74), Personable (1.786), and Leadership (2.082) averages, but not so in the BA GPA (0.100) averages. For this reason, the BA GPAs were not considered in establishing the criteria for participants in this study. A similar finding was made by Dr. Rosanne Trinka Reimer on the significance of BA GPAs to teaching performance in her dissertation study of Baltimore County Public Schools (1983).

| | STANDARD INTERVIEW RESULTS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| BA GPA | Sect A-F Teaching Effectiveness | Sect H Personable | Sect I Leadership | |
| 2.974 | 88.85 | 8.025 | 8.125 | EMPLOYED ——AVERAGES |
| 2.874 | 65.11 | 6.239 | 6.043 | ——NON-SELECTED AVERAGES |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| High = | 3.3+ (10) | 100+ (7) | 9+ (14) | 9+ (15) | ) DISTRIBUTION |
| Good = | 2.9+ (15)*** | 85+ (18) **** | 8+ (10) **** | 8+ (8) **** | ) OF DATA |
| Low = | 2.6+ (8) | 70+ (9) | 6+ (13) | 6+ (13) | ) APPLICANTS |
| Reject= | 2.5- (5) | 69- (4) | 5- (1) | 5- (2) | ) SELECTED |

Thus, the subjects of the study were selected without regard to their sex, age, name, or race/ethnicity. The only criteria for selection were the "teaching effectiveness," "personable," and "leadership" interview scores.

Although not a direct part of this study, this writer has also used group interview panels. After brief training sessions he has found a high degree of numerical similarity among interview panel members. Such training involved explaining the meaning of the "right" response phrases to the panel members and some trials to assess their low to high (1 to 5) assessments. Also in such situations, both certificated and non-certificated persons have been panel members with no noticeable differences in recorded perceptions. The criteria seem to be sufficiently specific so that the degree to which an interviewee responds is measured rather consistently.

As the reader will appreciate, a major task in this interview system is to compose interview questions and determine the BFOQ criteria desired. During a recent selection process for Director of Pupil Services, for example, interview questions were not finalized until after a month's study of the knowledge, skills, and abilities ("KSAs") desired for the position was conducted and composition of questions then determined to provide equal opportunities for interviewees to be evaluated according to their responses. Determining questions and criteria for the director-level position were decided by the personnel director and superintendent. No one else was involved in these procedures. Likewise, composition of interview questions and criteria for other positions is not in the "public domain" and is not done by a committee. It is the sole domain of the personnel department and superintendent.

## B. Establishing On-The-Job Performance Scores

To compare the on-the-job performance of the 14 persons who interviewed consistently high (Group A) and the 12 persons who interviewed consistently less well (Group B), the following criteria were considered:

1. Actual absences 1 Sep - 31 Dec 85 for persons employed during that entire period.

2. Voluntary participation in a TESA course offered in the school district (on Saturdays at a cost of $40 per participant). TESA is a

college-level course on Teacher Expectations for Student Achievement and deals with improving teaching strategies.

3. Voluntary participation with the Lorian City School District Endowment Fund by payroll deduction in effect as of 31 Dec 85. This criterion was selected for analysis because it was available for objective review, not necessarily to imply that by such participation a person is therefore a better teacher. Like mountain climbing, it was there — worthy of a look. Employees are regularly encouraged to participate via payroll deduction (with $1 or $2 suggested, a nominal amount).

4. The criteria selected for making new-teacher telephone reference checks of applicants formed a major portion of determining performance. The principals were contacted by the superintendent's staff for their comments concerning the below mentioned items, to be judged on a 1 through 10 basis. The principals were not aware of the purpose of the study. The persons calling were not aware of the details of the study. This performance evaluation method was used because of the absence of numerical objectivity in regular teacher evaluation methods. Also, local experience with this telephone reference procedure for teaching applicants, rather than relying on written recommendations, has proven to be more reliable.

In regard to a possible "Pygmalion effect" -- evaluator bias due to previous positive or negative information -- principals were not aware of the interview scores of new teachers and they had received no instruction with this selection system. Principals were also not involved with personnel department interviews. After personnel department interviews, candidates were referred to principals for final-level interviews and recommendations for hiring. Thus, it is unlikely that the principals' responses to the current survey were influenced by knowledge of the personnel department interview.

Below is the script the two persons from the superintendent's office used when calling for references. In order to insure greater objectivity, the personnel department staff was not involved with compiling performance data. The superintendent wrote the principals involved, informed them that one of his assistants would be calling, and asked for their cooperation. A copy of the memo he wrote the principals is enclosed in the appendix to this report.

> "I'm _____, from the Superintendent's office. In conjunction with a special study being conducted by the Superintendent, I'm calling for a reference check on _____. I'd like to ask you several questions about _____'s performance as a teacher in Lorain City Schools. For your convenience, please respond on a 1 through 10 basis with 1 the lowest and 10 the highest. If you have no basis to judge a particular trait, please say "Zero" or "No basis to judge." Your remarks will be confidential and will be grouped with other references. Your comments will not be

available to the teacher. Thus, your candor will be greatly appreciated. Do you have questions or comments before I continue?

1. Enthusiasm w/ teaching profession.
2. Ethnic/racial sensitivity.
3. Sense of organization.
4. Loyalty.
5. Discipline & control of students.
6. Morality.
7. Attendance and punctuality.
8. Cooperation working w/ others.
9. Knowledge of subject matter.
10. On a 1 to 10 basis, the degree to which you'd want this person to teach your children.

Eleven building administrators were telephoned by two persons in the superintendent's office (NOT personnel office) and asked their judgments concerning the above items for the 26 subjects of this study. An alphabetical list of the subjects was made and the two persons in the superintendent's office called every other name on the list. There was no indication as to who was in Group A or Group B. The two callers requested performance comments for persons in each group. Also, in some instances individual principals were called by both persons. Once the principals were on the line, the telephone reference checks required about two minutes.

Some descriptive data were also compiled for the subjects, including:

1. Age (as of 31 Dec 85).
2. Salary (as of 1 Sep 85).
3. BA GPAs.
4. Minority representation (Black & Hispanic).
5. Date of board hiring action.
6. Years teaching experience (as of 1 Sep 85).
7. Number of graduate hours beyond BA (as of 1 Sep 85).

The source used to determine age data was the post-employment state retirement system application form, since such information is not asked on the district application form prior to employment.

## III. RESULTS

The above methods were used to gather the data reported below. Since Items # 1 - # 3 were the basis for inclusion in the study, differences there are by design. Items # 4 - # 10 are descriptive and not significant as performance criteria. Items # 11 - # 23 are the performance criteria with which the basic research question of this study is to be answered.

Group A contains the averages of the 14 persons who interviewed consistently higher than Group B.

| | "A" Group | "B" Group |
|---|---|---|
| **BASIS FOR SELECTION** | | |
| 1. Teaching effectiveness score | 97.857 | 76.416 |
| 2. Personable score | 8.857 | 7.166 |
| 3. Leadership score | 9.285 | 6.583 |
| **DESCRIPTIVE DATA** | | |
| 4. BA GPA | 3.046 | 2.9945 |
| 5. Salary | $18,538 | $17,696 |
| 6. Average date of hire | 9 July | 4 Sept |
| 7. Age | 34.5 | 35.166 |
| 8. Minority representation | 42.85% | 8.33% |
| 9. Years teaching experience | 5.285 | 4.041 |
| 10. No. grad. hours beyond BA | 5.071 | 4.22 |
| **PERFORMANCE DATA** | | |
| 11. Actual absences | 1.346 | 1.5 |
| 12. TESA training | 35.7% | 8.3% |
| 13. Endowment Fund participation | 71% | 0% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Enthusiasm w/teaching profession | 8.928 | 8.166 |
| 15. | Ethnic/racial sensitivity | 8.571 | 8.0909 |
| 16. | Sense of organization | 8.214 | 7.583 |
| 17. | Loyalty | 9.166 | 8.5 |
| 18. | Discipline & control of students | 8.357 | 7.166 |
| 19. | Morality | 9.375 | 8.714 |
| 20. | Attendance & punctuality | 9.357 | 8.833 |
| 21. | Cooperation working w/others | 9.142 | 8.916 |
| 22. | Knowledge of subject matter | 8.428 | 7.833 |
| 23. | On a 1 to 10 basis, the degree to which the principals would want these persons teaching their own children | 8.857 | 8.0 |

The "morality" question was especially troublesome for some respondents because of the vagueness or application of the term. This item has also been questioned with pre-employment telephone references with similar objections. It is included in pre-employment reference checks because of a responsibility to assess the morality of persons employed to work with young people. In such pre-employment instances, it is the proof that the personnel department has on record that morality was considered. The item was included with this performance study because of the design used to determine performance. Of the 26 persons in both groups, responses to Item # 19 (Morality) were given in 15 instances. The question on "Loyalty" (# 17) also posed some difficulty to administrators making assessments. Only 22 out of 26 responses were received. In all other areas, administrators responded to each item with no objections.

As the data reflect, the persons in Group A were absent less often than those in Group B. Although the difference was small, the period of the study was also small (1 Sep - 31 Dec 85). One could assume that over a longer period, a greater difference would occur. Of the 14 in Group A, 13 were employed prior to 1 September. Of the 12 in Group B, 7 were employed prior to 1 September. The computation of average absences was based only on the persons employed from 1 Sep through 31 Dec 85.

## IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

On 100% of the 13 performance-related items, the group which interviewed better also performed better. From a probability standpoint if there were no differences between Group A and Group B -- as though a coin were tossed -- one would predict Group A would appear superior 6 or 7 times out of 13. The more times over 50% that Group A is superior, the more probable a genuine difference exists. This writer finds based on this study, a genuine difference does exist between Group A and Group B and, thus, that the interview in the personnel department has a predictive quality in being able to identify through the interview process applicants more likely to be more effective teachers.

On the job, the applicants who interviewed better (Group A) had better attendance, were more involved in voluntary in-service training, and were judged to have more enthusiasm toward the teaching profession than applicants whose interview scores were lower (Group B). Based on the study, members of Group A displayed more ethnic/racial sensitivity, a greater sense of organization, and more loyalty. Group A members had greater discipline and control of students, were more cooperative working with others, and had greater knowledge of their subject matter. On each of the performance criterion studied in this report, the group which interviewed better also had better performance ratings.

It is important to emphasize that although the differences are small in some instances, the initial difference to determine membership in Group A and Group B was also small. The difference was not between "excellent" and "rejected" applicants, but between those whose interview scores were consistently higher than another group when all members of both groups met a high level of acceptability. It can only be assumed that greater differences would have been realized between performance evaluations of those persons hired and those not hired; but, of course, performance evaluations were not available for persons not hired.

In other words, based on the results of this study an applicant with interview scores of "85," "8," and "9" would be predictably a more effective teacher than an applicant with interview scores of "50," "6," and "4."

The minority representation -- the percentage of Blacks and Hispanics -- in Group A was 42.85% and in Group B was 8.33%. Lorain City School District has a commitment (emphasized by Federal Court order) to increase the minority representation among its employees. From this writer's perspective, minority applicants perform competitively well on standardized interviews. As current literature indicates, although there is a scarcity of certificated minority teacher candidates, those who have completed

teacher training programs have on the average overcome more barriers than their majority counterparts.

The average date of board hiring action (9 July for Group A vs. 4 Sept for Group B) -- an almost two-month difference -- supports what personnel officers often state: Persons hired earlier are better candidates and the corollary, "August hires" are lesser in quality.

If the BA GPAs were rounded off to the nearest tenth, there would be no difference between Group A and Group B (3.046 and 2.9945, respectively), since there was only a .0515 difference (on a 4.0 basis). A similar negligible difference was also reported between the BA GPAs of persons hired (2.974) and not hired (2.874). Although this does not imply that BA GPAs are not relevant, it does not appear to have BFOQ significance in this study since all group averages hovered around 3.0 (A = 4.0).

The average salary for Group A was slightly higher than Group B (by $842, $18,538 vs. $17,696). Yet, Group A was slightly younger than Group B (by 8 months, 34.5 years vs. 35.166). The difference in salary was not, therefore, due to a difference in age, but due to additional training and experience. This is also supported by the difference between Group A and B in TESA training. Group A had 35.7% participating, whereas Group B had only 8.3%.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That documented BFOQ interview and selection techniques be continued for future study and improvement of decision-making in these areas, as well as for protection of the board's assets to defend and justify decisions when complaints are made (eg, EEOC or OCRC).

2. That the members of Group A represent a valuable resource for future study.

3. That perceptions of persons actually interviewed be studied so that interview procedures can be improved with the benefit of that additional data. An on-going monitoring of their perceptions of the BFOQ relevancy of the personal interview might be useful to demonstrate a commitment to self-monitoring and self-improvement.

4. That performance evaluations of employees include a numerical basis to facilitate future analyses of the relationships to performance and other factors. Such analyses should result in another way to systematically improve instruction.

5. That other standardized interview questions be developed to study the correlation between the present questions and other questions. It may be, as this writer suspects, that the specific questions are less significant in predictability than the equal opportunity processes.

6. That the personnel selection processes be recognized as having an important impact on the curriculum and instruction mission and that a BFOQ selection "system" has advantages over relying on the individual judgment of a personnel officer.

7. That the maximum number of persons be interviewed through such practices as an "open interview" policy whereby any person desiring to be interviewed is granted a personal interview. As reported here, over 60% of the persons interviewed were less than acceptable. If the district is to continue to select high quality teachers, the greater the number of interviews, the greater the pool from which to draw.

Lorain City School District — Lorain, Ohio 44052-1493
Certificated Personnel Department

# APPLICANT INTERVIEW PROFILE

Name: SSAN ID #:

Address:

Phones: Home ( ) Permanent ( )

Interview date: By:

| Spec Pref Codes | Cert areas |
|---|---|
| | |
| | ____ |
| | ____ |
| | ____ |

STANDARD INTERVIEW RESULTS

| BA GPA | Sect A-F Teaching Effectiveness | Sect H Personable | Sect I Leadership | Reference Checks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High = | 3.3+ | 100+ | 9+ | 9+ |
| Good = | 2.9+ | 85+ | 8+ | 8+ |
| Low = | 2.6+ | 70+ | 6+ | 6+ |
| Reject= | 2.5- | 69- | 5- | 5- |

Applicant's major strengths (based on interview):

1.

Applicant's major weaknesses (based on interview):

1.

NOTE: Above interview data do NOT include reference checks; references must be checked before recommending for employment — preferably via telephone with at least one former employer.

---------- "B O T T O M L I N E" ----------

_____ A. Highest quality applicant; consider for any applicable vacancy.
_____ B. Very good applicant; keep applicant current.
_____ C. Average applicant.
_____ D. Below average applicant; only consider if no one else available.
_____ F. Unsatisfactory applicant; consider no further.

Spec Pref Codes: E=Ethnic; L=Lorain resident; A-F="Bottom line"

***** C O N F I D E N T I A L *****

Lorain City Schools

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L  T E L E P H O N E  R E F E R E N C E  C H E C K

Teacher:_____ Date:_____ By:_____

Person called:_____ Phone #: (____)_____

Title/school/location:_____

"I'm _____, from the Superintendent's office. In conjunction with a special study being conducted by the Superintendent, I'm calling for a reference check on _____. I'd like to ask you several questions about _____'s performance as a teacher in Lorain City Schools. For your convenience, please respond on a 1 through 10 basis with 1 the lowest and 10 the highest. If you have no basis to judge a particular trait, please say "Zero" or "No basis to judge." Your remarks will be confidential and will be grouped with other references. Your comments will not be available to the teacher. Thus, your candor will be greatly appreciated. Do you have questions or comments before I continue?

| | | (circle) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Enthusiasm w/ teaching profession. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 2. | Ethnic/racial sensitivity. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 3. | Sense of organization. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 4. | Loyalty. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 5. | Discipline & control of students. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 6. | Morality. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 7. | Attendance and punctuality. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 8. | Cooperation working w/ others. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 9. | Knowledge of subject matter. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |
| 10. | On a 1 to 10 basis, the degree to which you'd want this person to teach your own children. | :_1_:_2_:_3_:_4_:_5_:_6_:_7_:_8_:_9_:_10_: | :_0_: |

REFERENCE SUMMARY

Do you have any additional comments? _____

_____

_____

"Thank you for your assistance and cooperation."



C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

Lorain City Schools

LORAIN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
1020 Seventh Street
Lorain, Ohio 44052

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE

M E M O R A N D U M

TO:

DATE: January 24, 1986

RE: Survey

FROM: John W. Pavic

In the near future Judy Wright or Judy Marks will contact you for your responses to a study I am conducting dealing with one or two of your staff members. They will ask you the questions on the attached "reference check".

The survey should only take a few minutes. Please be candid. Only group data will be used in the study. Neither you nor the teachers involved will be identified. This does not violate any evaluation procedures in the negotiated agreeement.

Thank you for your assistance in this study.

JWP/jw

Attachment

Some casual after thoughts ...

This study did not claim to be a definitive study of the relationships between teacher interview scores and on-the-job performance. The author recognized that the numbers involved in the study were small. However, it did attempt to demonstrate a framework or structure by which relationships between interview performance and job performance can be studied. If interviews are to be productive, there should be some predictive result of the interview with job performance: That is, persons who interview "better" should also perform "better" on the job. Otherwise, the interview processes do not serve the purpose of selecting the "best" candidates.

The essence of being an Equal Opportunity Employer is to provide all applicants an equal opportunity to demonstrate how well (and less well) they can perform job-related tasks. By using a similar "yardstick" to measure all applicants, equal employment opportunities are provided to each applicant. Also, as implied by this study, better persons are are selected when job-related, equal employment opportunites are used.

Studying relationships between teacher interviews and on-the-job performance is a relatively new study area for personnel administrators. There's not much recent research about it in the actual school setting. Reader comments concerning the relationships of interviews and job performance are welcome by this author.

Peter Loehr